IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

WEDNESDAY, THE SEVENTH DAY OF JULY
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE G. BIKSHAPATHY

And
THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE B.SESHASAYANA REDDY

W.A.NO : 1072 of 2004

Between:

V.C. Rangappa s/o A.V. Chinna Rangappa, aged about 69 yrs,

R/o 2/467, Ragithota street, Tadipatri, Anantapur Dist.

…Appellant-Writ petitioner

And

1. Chairman-cum-Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-

Labour Court, Anantapur,

2. Chairman, Tadpatri Co-op. Town Bank Ltd., rep, by its Secretary, Tadpatri, Anantapur District.

...Respondents-Respondents

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.V.VENKATARAMANA**,**

Counsel for the Respondent 1: G.P. FOR LABOUR &

2: Mr. O. Manohar Reddy, Advocate

The Court Made the Following :

JUDGMENT: (Per Hon'ble Sri G.BIKSHAPATHY, J)

The Writ Appeal is filed challenging the order passed by the learned single Judge in W.P. No.8064 of 1998 dated: 02-01-2003.

2. The appellant is workman. He filed an application before the Labour Court under Section 33 (c) (2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, seeking differential wages for the period covered by suspension. The Tribunal, after considering the matter, passed an order in M.P.No. 64 of 1994 and allowed the petition in part and the respondent-management was directed to calculate and compute the amounts payable to the petitioner, in the light of the observations made therein within three months, failing which the amounts shall carry simple interest at 6% per annum. Against the said order, the matter was carried in Writ Petition No. 8064 of 1998 and the learned single Judge dismissed the same by an order dated 02.01.2003, against which, the

present Writ Appeal has been filed.

3. The learned counsel for the appellant-workman submits that the Labour Court has unduly denied certain benefits which accrued to him which he is entitled to under Section 33 (c) (2) of the Industrial Disputes Act and the learned single Judge ought to have allowed the same which was refused by the Labour Court.

4. We have perused the order of the Labour Court and also the order of the learned single Judge. The learned single Judge rightly refused to interfere with the order as the computation under Sec. 33 (c) (2) of the Industrial Disputes Act is the prerogative of the Labour Court and the Labour Court having partly allowed the petition, the learned single Judge refused to interfere with the matter. Thus, we do not find any merit in the appeal.

5. Accordingly, the Writ Appeal is dismissed. No costs.

_____

G. BIKSHAPATHY,J

_____

B.SESHSAYANA REDDY,J

Dated: 07-07-2004

Glv/vp

To,

1. Chairman-cum-Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum- Labour Court, Anantapur,
2. Chairman, Tadpatri Coop. Town Bank Ltd., rep. By its Secretary, Tadpatri, Anantapur District.
3. Two C.Cs to the Government Pleader for Labour, High Court Buildings,

Hyderabad. (O.U.T)

4. Two C.D copies.